

App. No.: 09/681430
Filed: April 3, 2001
Conf. No.: 4775

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS

The Examiner is most respectfully requested to reconsider both her art and technical objections to the claims and also to the disclosure in light of the foregoing amendments and following comments.

First considering her objection to the disclosure, the Examiner states that the claimed "related machine housing" is not shown or described. However, "housing" is used to describe only the "rotating electrical machine" not the related one. The specification clearly calls for the machine to have a housing.

In a like manner claim 1 does not refer to a "related machine shaft". The claim only refers to the drive for the related machine not a shaft thereof.

As to the "sleeve type" bearing recited in certain of the claims, it is true that the word "sleeve" is not used in the specification, but the description of the bearings and their illustration would leave those skilled in the art to understand that they are of this type. However if the Examiner would prefer, the specification will be amended to include this word as long as the Examiner does not take the position that this constitutes new matter. If she feels that it would, the word will be left out of the claims.

As to the detachable connection of the supporting post as recited in several of the claims, the specification and drawings clearly show that the post is received in an opening and thus is detachable. Again if the Examiner would prefer a change in the wording, applicant will comply as long as the Examiner does not contend that such a change would constitute new matter.

Aside from the foregoing, it is believed that all formal matters have been addressed. If the Examiner feels otherwise, she is solicited to call the undersigned as it is believed that that would solve any outstanding issues.

Turning now to the art rejections, the claims have been amended to address the Examiner's objections and in doing so also to more fully define over the Kato reference that fails to show or describe a related machine housed in an end closure of the electric motor. It would be helpful if the Examiner maintains her position if she would more clearly refer to the allegedly corresponding elements of the reference rather than using reference numerals that do not appear in it. For example, she refers to a stator "25" which does appear in the specification but not the drawings.


App. No.: 09/681430
Filed: April 3, 2001
Conf. No.: 4775

Page 7 of 7

Also the generator 1 is not contained in any end closure of the motor, these being the unnumbered members carrying the bearings 23 and 24 which journal its ends. Neither of these contain the generator 1, which is carried by the transmission casing that is not numbered. Also the generator 1 is driven from the unshown engine once it is started not by the starter motor 2.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for favorable action and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717
4821 Pacific Time